



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,496	12/21/2000	John K. Walton	EMC2-087PUS	9763
22494	7590	01/13/2004	EXAMINER	
DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP			CHUNG, PHUNG M	
SUITE 101			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
275 TURNPIKE STREET			2133	
CANTON, MA 02021-2310			DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/746,496	WALTON ET AL.
	Examiner Phung M. Chung	Art Unit 2133

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 3-5 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>8</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. The objection of the Abstract of the invention is maintained . (See paragraph 1 of the office action dated on 7/3/03).
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bock et al (5,948,119) in view of Kim et al (6,253,346) and Szczepanek (6,414,956)

As per claim 1, Bock et al disclose the invention substantially as claimed, comprising the steps of: checking a CRC of data words (col. 1, lines 57-65), each data word in the series being associated with a clock pulse (Fig. 7: block 152). Bock et al do not specifically disclose a delay element for delaying the data from passing to an output. However, Kim et al disclose a CRC logic portion for delaying data output. (See col. 1, lines 2022 and col. 3, lines 51-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate the teaching of delaying of the data output of Kim et al into the invention of Bock et al to allow such error detection and/or correction to take place. Bock et al and Kim et al do not disclose the step of corrupting the delayed data if such checking determines a CRC error. However, Szczepanek disclose corrupting the delayed data if such checking determines a CRC error (col. 6, line 35-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to incorporate the corrupting of the delayed data if such checking determined a CRC error as taught by Szczepanek into the invention of Bock et al and Kim et al so that any frame with an invalid CRC can be discarded. Szczepanek does not disclose the step of checking the output to determine whether there has been a corruption of the delayed data. However, it would have been a matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to check the output to determine whether there has been a corruption of the delayed data as needed if desired.

As per claim 2, the teaching of Bock et al, Kim et al and Szczepanek have been discussed above. They did not disclose wherein the corrupting comprising corrupting a parity bit of one such data words. However, it would have been a matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to corrupt a parity bit of one data words instead of CRC if desired as needed.

4. Claims 3-5 are allowable.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2133

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phung M. Chung whose telephone number is 703-305-9686. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decay can be reached on 703-305-9595. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



PHUNG M. CHUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER